# Communication capacity of mixed quantum $t$ designs

Sarah Brandsen,[1,*] Michele Dall'Arno,[1,†] and Anna Szymusiak[2,‡]

[1] *Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, 117543 Singapore, Republic of Singapore*

[2] *Institute of Mathematics, Jagiellonian University, Łojasiewicza 6, 30-348 Kraków, Poland*

(Dated: 5th September 2016)

We operationally introduce mixed quantum $t$ designs as the most general arbitrary-rank extension of projective quantum $t$ designs which preserves indistinguishability from the uniform distribution for $t$ copies. First, we derive upper bounds on the classical communication capacity of any mixed $t$ design measurement, for $t \in [1, 5]$. Second, we explicitly compute the classical communication capacity of several mixed $t$ design measurements, including the depolarized version of: any qubit and qutrit symmetric, informationally complete (SIC) measurement and complete mutually unbiased bases (MUB), the qubit icosahedral measurement, the Hoggar SIC measurement, any anti-SIC (where each element is proportional to the projector on the subspace orthogonal to one of the elements of the original SIC), and the uniform distribution over pure effects.

arXiv:1603.06320v2 [quant-ph] 2 Sep 2016

## I. INTRODUCTION

Arguably, the class of quantum configurations with the broadest application in any communication protocol is that of projective $t$ designs [1, 2], including e.g. symmetric, informationally complete (SIC) measurements [3–8] and mutually unbiased bases (MUB) [9–13]. Projective $t$ designs can informally be defined by the properties of i) being indistinguishable from the uniform distribution up to $t$ copies, and ii) comprising only pure elements. While indistinguishability from the uniform distribution is an *operational* restriction of the protocol, introduced e.g. to ensure that no information leaks to an adversary, purity is a purely *mathematical* idealization bound to be lost in the presence of noise.

Previous generalizations of projective $t$ designs to the arbitrary-rank case were either limited to specific subsets, such as SICs or MUBs [14–18], or relaxed the operational property of indistinguishability from the uniform distribution given $t$ copies [19]. In this work, we introduce the class of mixed $t$ designs as the most general extension of projective $t$ designs that preserves the operational property of indistinguishability from the uniform distribution up to $t$ copies, while relaxing the mathematical assumption of pure elements.

In any communication scenario, such as quantum key distribution [20] or locking [21] of information in quantum states, a relevant figure of merit is the classical communication capacity, namely the maximum amount of information that can reliably be extracted per use, in the asymptotic limit. More precisely, the celebrated Shannon's coding theorem [22] guarantees that, for any communication channel, there exist an encoding and a decoding such that the amount of information that can be transmitted with null error probability is equal to the channel capacity, and also that no better performance can be achieved.

For measurements, the capacity was proven to be equivalent to its single-shot analogy, i.e. the informational power, introduced in Ref. [23]. Therein, the simple case of SIC measurement of a qubit was solved. Subsequently, considerable interest arose for computing the capacity of several symmetric measurements [24–32]. With very limited exceptions (e.g. mirror symmetric measurements, introduced in Ref. [23]), mixed $t$ designs introduced here (with $t \geq 2$, where our results provide novel insights) encompass all the classes of non-trivial measurements for which the classical capacity is known, and extend such classes by adding e.g. the isotropically noisy version of projective $t$ designs.

Here, we introduce mixed $t$ designs as the most general class of quantum configurations that are indistinguishable from the uniform distribution given $t$ copies, and discuss some of their basic properties. First, we derive upper bounds on the classical communication capacity of any mixed $t$ design measurement, for $t \in [1, 5]$. Second, we explicitly compute the classical communication capacity of several mixed $t$ design measurements, including the depolarized version of: any qubit and qutrit SIC measurement and complete MUB, the qubit icosahedral measurement, the Hoggar SIC measurement, any anti-SIC (where each element is proportional to the projector on the subspace orthogonal to one of the elements of the original SIC), and the uniform distribution over pure effects.

This work is structured as follows. In Sec. II A we introduce mixed $t$ designs and derive some of their basic properties. In Sec. II B we discuss some fundamental facts about the communication capacity of quantum measurements. In Sec. II C we present our main results about the capacity of mixed $t$ designs measurements. Finally, we summarize our results and discuss some outlooks in Sec. III.

* sbrandse@caltech.edu

† cqtmda@nus.edu.sg

‡ anna.szymusiak@uj.edu.pl

## II. CLASSICAL CAPACITY OF MIXED $t$ DESIGNS

### A. Mixed $t$ designs

Let us first recall some standard definitions and facts from quantum theory [33]. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a (finite) $d$-dimensional Hilbert space, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the space of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all the positive-semidefinite operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The most general quantum *state* in $\mathcal{H}$ is described by a density matrix, namely a trace-one operator in $\mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$. Adopting the Dirac notation, any pure state $\phi$ is also denoted by $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ (thus $\phi$ corresponds to the projector on $|\phi\rangle$). Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a Borel locally compact metric space equipped with a Borel measure $\mu$ (In particular, one can think of a finite set with the uniform measure or a locally compact group with the Haar measure, e.g. the group $U(d)$ of unitaries in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$.) The most general quantum preparation in $\mathcal{H}$ is described by a quantum *ensemble*, namely a measurable function $\rho : A \ni x \mapsto \rho_x := p_x\hat{\rho}_x \in \mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$, where $\hat{\rho}_x$ is a quantum state, and $x \mapsto p_x$ is a probability density (with respect to $\mu$). The most general quantum *measurement* in $\mathcal{H}$ is described by a positive operator-valued measure (POVM). In particular, a POVM can be defined by a measurable function $\pi : A \ni y \mapsto \pi_y := dp_y\hat{\pi}_y \in \mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$, where $\hat{\pi}_y$ is a quantum state, $y \mapsto p_y$ is a probability density (with respect to $\mu$), and $d\int \mathrm{d}\mu(y)p_y\hat{\pi}_y = \mathbb{1}$, the identity operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$.

We introduce in the following some quantities that characterize ensembles and POVMs. For any measurable function $\chi$ from $A$ to positive semidefinite operators $x \mapsto \chi_x := \nu p_x\hat{\chi}_x \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\nu$ is a normalization, $x \mapsto p_x$ is a probability density and $\hat{\chi}_x$ a quantum state, we call

$$\mu_k(\chi) := \int \mathrm{d}\mu(x)p_x \operatorname{Tr}[\hat{\chi}_x^k],$$

the $k$-th *moment* of $\chi$. For any pure state $\phi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, we call

$$\gamma_k(\chi, \phi) := \int \mathrm{d}\mu(x)p_x \left(\langle\phi|\,\hat{\chi}_x\,|\phi\rangle\right)^k,$$

the *index of coincidence*.

Operationally, a *projective quantum $t$ design ensemble* is an ensemble $x \mapsto \phi_x := p_x\hat{\phi}_x$ of pure states that cannot be discriminated from the uniformly distributed ensemble of pure states – other than by trivial guessing – when given $t$ copies. Analogously, a *projective quantum $t$ design POVM* is operationally defined as a POVM $y \mapsto \pi_y := q_y\hat{\pi}_y$ such that the ensemble $\phi_y := \operatorname{Tr}_2[\Phi^+(\mathbb{1} \otimes \pi_y)] = \frac{1}{d}\pi_y^T$ steered on a maximally entangled state $|\Phi^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_i |i, i\rangle$ is a projective quantum $t$ design ensemble. More generally, a *projective quantum $t$ design* can be defined as a measurable function $\phi$ from $A$ to rank-one positive semidefinite operators $x \mapsto \phi_x := \nu p_x\hat{\phi}_x$ such that

$$\int \mathrm{d}\mu(x)p_x\hat{\phi}_x^{\otimes t} = \int \mathrm{d}g\,|\phi_g\rangle\langle\phi_g|^{\otimes t},$$

where $\mathrm{d}g$ denotes the uniform (Haar) probability measure over the group $U(d)$ of unitaries in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, see [1].

We introduce mixed $t$ designs as a generalization of projective $t$ designs that relax the constraint of being rank-one projectors while preserving indistinguishability from the uniform distribution given $t$ copies. Operationally, we define *mixed $t$ design ensembles* $x \mapsto \rho_x := p_x\hat{\rho}_x$ as ensembles of (possibly) mixed states that cannot be distinguished from the uniform distribution given $t$ copies. Analogously, we operationally define *mixed $t$ design POVMs* as POVMs $y \mapsto \pi_y$ such that the ensemble $\rho_y := \operatorname{Tr}_2[\Phi^+(\mathbb{1} \otimes \pi_y)] = \frac{1}{d}\pi_y^T$ steered on a maximally entangled state $|\Phi^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_i |i, i\rangle$ is a mixed $t$ design ensemble. More generally, we define *mixed quantum $t$ designs* as follows.

**Definition 1** (Mixed $t$ design)**.** *We call a mixed quantum $t$ design any measurable function $\chi$ from $A$ to positive semidefinite operators $x \mapsto \chi_x := \nu p_x\hat{\chi}_x$, where $x \mapsto p_x$ is a probability density (with respect to $\mu$) if*

$$\int \mathrm{d}\mu(x)p_x\hat{\chi}_x^{\otimes t} := \int \mathrm{d}g(U_g\hat{\chi}U_g^\dagger)^{\otimes t}, \tag{1}$$

*where* d$g$ *is the Haar probability measure on $U(d)$ and $\hat{\chi}$ is some unit-trace positive-semidefinite operator.*

In the following, for brevity we refer to mixed $t$ designs simply as $t$ designs. Let us prove some important properties of $t$ designs. First, notice that if $\chi$ is a $t$ design, also $\chi^T$ is a $t$ design, and thus the operational interpretation of $t$ design POVMs immediately follows. Notice also that by partial tracing Eq. (1) it immediately follows that any $t$ design is also a $k$ design for any $1 \le k \le t$, and therefore in particular

$$\int \mathrm{d}\mu(x)p_x\hat{\chi}_x = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{d},$$

for any $t$ design $\chi$.

The moments up to $t$ of any $t$ design $\chi$ are given by

$$\mu_k(\chi) = \operatorname{Tr}[\hat{\chi}^k]. \tag{2}$$

for any $1 \le k \le t$. This uniquely identifies $\hat{\chi}$ up to unitaries if $t \ge d$. Equation (2) can be readily verified by first multiplying Eq. (1) by the shift operator $S_t := \sum_{i_1,\dots i_t} \bigotimes_{j=1}^t |i_{j\oplus 1}\rangle\langle i_j|$ that replaces the state of $\mathcal{H}_{j\oplus 1}$ with $\mathcal{H}_j$ (here $\oplus$ denotes sum modulus $t$ and $\{|i_j\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$ is an orthonormal basis of space $\mathcal{H}_j$), and then tracing using the property of the shift operator that $\operatorname{Tr}[S_tV^{\otimes t}] = \operatorname{Tr}[V^t]$ for any $t$ and any Hermitian operator $V$.

For quantum $t$ designs $\chi$, it follows from the definition that for any $1 \le k \le t$ the index of coincidence $\gamma_k$ is

independent of $\phi$ and is given by

$$\gamma_k(\chi) = \binom{d+k-1}{k}^{-1} \mathrm{Tr}[P_k \hat{\chi}^{\otimes k}] = \frac{(d-1)!}{(d+k-1)!} B_k(x_1, \dots x_k), \quad (3)$$

where $P_k$ denotes the projector over the symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$, $x_i := (i-1)!\,\mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\chi}^i]$, and $B_k(x_1, \dots x_k)$ is the complete exponential Bell polynomial [34] given by

$$B_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} B_{k,j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-j+1}),$$

where

$$B_{k,j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-j+1}) = \sum \frac{k!}{i_1! \cdots i_{k-j+1}!} \left(\frac{x_1}{1!}\right)^{i_1} \cdots \left(\frac{x_{k-j+1}}{(k-j+1)!}\right)^{i_{k-j+1}},$$

and the sum is over all sequences $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k-j+1}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_{k-j+1} = j, \\ i_1 + 2i_2 + 3i_3 + \cdots + (k-j+1) i_{k-j+1} = k. \end{cases}$$

The second equality in Eq. (3) follows from a lengthy but straightforward counting argument. Therefore explicitly for $k \in [1, 5]$ one has

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_1 &= \frac{1}{d}, \\ \gamma_2 &= \frac{1+\mu_2}{d(d+1)}, \\ \gamma_3 &= \frac{1+3\mu_2+2\mu_3}{d(d+1)(d+2)}, \\ \gamma_4 &= \frac{1+6\mu_2+3\mu_2^2+8\mu_3+6\mu_4}{d(d+1)(d+2)(d+3)}, \\ \gamma_5 &= \frac{1+10\mu_2+15\mu_2^2+20\mu_3+30\mu_4+20\mu_2\mu_3+24\mu_5}{d(d+1)(d+2)(d+3)(d+4)}. \end{cases}$$

Relevant classes of $t$ designs include symmetric, informationally complete (SIC) POVMs [3, 5] and mutually unbiased bases (MUB) [9], as well as their mixed generalizations given by symmetric informationally complete measurements (SIM) [14, 15] and mutually unbiased measurements (MUM) [16]. Despite their importance, the existence of SICs and MUBs is still a matter of conjecture [6]. For SICs, existence has been proved analytically for dimensions $2-15$ and 17, 19, 24, 35, and 48 [3–5, 7, 8], and numerically for dimensions $2-67$ [5, 7]. For MUBs, existence is questioned for a dimension as small as 6 [10–12]. On the other hand, it is known that MUBs exist in infinitely many dimensions, i.e. all dimensions being prime powers [35]. Other than in the aforementioned communications protocols, SICs and MUBs have applications in quantum tomography [36], uncertainty relations [37], and in foundational problems [38–42].

Any function $\chi$ from $\{0, 1, \dots, d^2-1\}$ to positive semidefinite operators $x \mapsto \chi_x := \frac{\nu}{d^2} |\hat{\chi}_x\rangle\langle\hat{\chi}_x|$ such that

$$|\langle \hat{\chi}_x | \hat{\chi}_{x'} \rangle|^2 = \delta_{x,x'} + (1 - \delta_{x,x'}) \frac{1}{d+1},$$

for any $x$ and $x'$ defines a set $\{\chi_x\}_x$ which we call a symmetric informationally complete (SIC) set. Any measurable function $\chi$ from $\{0, 1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$ to positive semidefinite operators $(x, y) \mapsto \chi_{x,y} := \frac{\nu}{d(d+1)} |\hat{\chi}_{x,y}\rangle\langle\hat{\chi}_{x,y}|$ such that

$$|\langle \hat{\chi}_{x,y} | \hat{\chi}_{x',y'} \rangle|^2 = \delta_{x,x'}\delta_{y,y'}, + (1 - \delta_{x,x'}) \frac{1}{d},$$

for any $x$, $y$, $x'$, and $y'$ defines a set $\{\chi_{x,y}\}_{x,y}$ which we call a mutually unbiased set. For simplicity, we use the notation $\chi_{x,y} = \chi_{dx+y}$.

An explicit way to construct families of mixed $t$ designs is by the affine combination of any mixed $t$ design $x \mapsto \chi_x := p_x \hat{\chi}_x$ with the maximally mixed operator as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\chi_x) = \lambda \chi_x + (1 - \lambda)\,\mathrm{Tr}[\chi_x] \frac{\mathbb{1}}{d},$$

for any $\lambda$ such that $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\chi_x) \geq 0\ \forall x$, as follows by applying $\mathcal{D}_\lambda^{\otimes t}$ to both sides of Eq. (1) and noticing that the map $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ commutes with any unitary channel. More precisely, let $\hat{\chi}_x := \sum_k \alpha_{x,k} |\phi_{x,k}\rangle\langle\phi_{x,k}|$ be a spectral decomposition of $\hat{\chi}_x$ and let $\alpha_{\max} := \max_{x,k} \alpha_{x,k}$ and $\alpha_{\min} := \min_{x,k} \alpha_{x,k}$. Then by direct inspection it follows that $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\chi_x) \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\lambda \in \left[ \frac{1}{1 - d\alpha_{\max}} \leq \frac{1}{1-d}, \frac{1}{1 - d\alpha_{\min}} \geq 1 \right]. \quad (4)$$

The linear map $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ corresponds to a depolarizing channel if and only if $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then it follows that the depolarized version of any $t$ design is a $t$ design. Furthermore, for any $t$ design $\chi$, we define the corresponding *anti $t$ design* as $\mathcal{D}_{(1-d\alpha_{\max})^{-1}}(\chi)$. Notice that due to Eq. (4) any anti $t$ design is a $t$ design. Finally one has the following simple relation between the moments of any $t$ design $\chi$ and those of its depolarized version $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\chi)$:

$$\mu_k(\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\chi)) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \lambda^n \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{d}\right)^{k-n} \mu_n(\chi).$$

### B. Communication capacity

Let us first recall some standard definitions and facts from information theory [43]. Intuitively, a means of quantifying the distinctiveness of two given probability densities $p$ and $q$ on $A$ (with respect to $\mu$) is given by the *relative entropy* $\mathrm{D}\left(p \middle\| q\right)$, also known as the Kullback-Leibler divergence, defined as

$$\mathrm{D}\left(p \middle\| q\right) := \int \mathrm{d}\mu(x) p_x \ln \frac{p_x}{q_x}.$$

A measure of the correlation between any two given random variables $X$ and $Y$ distributed according to the joint

probability density $p_{(X,Y)}$, is given by the *mutual information* $I(X;Y)$ defined as

$$I(X;Y) := \mathrm{D}\left(p_{(X,Y)}\middle\|p_X p_Y\right),$$

where $p_X$ and $p_Y$ are the marginal probability distributions. For any ensemble $\rho$ and POVM $\pi$ we denote with $I(\rho,\pi)$ the mutual information $I(X;Y)$ between random variables $X$ and $Y$ distributed according to $(x,y)\mapsto p_{x,y} := \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x\pi_y]$.

Following Ref. [25], we define the capacity of any POVM as follows.

**Definition 2** (Unassisted classical capacity of POVMs)**.** *The unassisted classical capacity of any POVM $\pi$ is given by*

$$C(\pi) := \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\max_{\rho} I(\rho,\pi^{\otimes t}),$$

*where $\pi^{\otimes t}$ stands for the POVM $y\mapsto\pi_y^{\otimes t}$ and the maximum is over ensembles $\rho$.*

The operational interpretation of Definition 2 is provided by Shannon's noisy-channel coding theorem [22], which proves that the capacity represents the maximum amount of information that can be reliably conveyed through POVM $\pi$ per use of the device, in the asymptotic limit.

Its explicit computation is in general very challenging. To proceed, let us first notice that the problem can be simplified as follows

$$C(\pi) = W(\pi) := \max_{\rho} I(\rho,\pi), \tag{5}$$

where $W(\pi)$ is the *informational power* [23–32] of POVM $\pi$, and its additivity has been proved in Ref. [23].

A further simplification in the calculation of $W(\pi)$ follows from the fact that, without loss of generality, the maximum in Eq. (5) can be taken over pure ensembles, as proved in Ref. [23].

We now introduce the following important preliminary result.

**Lemma 1.** *The capacity $C(\pi)$ of any POVM $y\mapsto dq_y\hat{\pi}_y$ is upper bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} C(\pi) \leq& \max_{\phi}\mathrm{D}\left(q^{\phi}\middle\|q\right)\\ =& \ln d - d\min_{\phi}\int \mathrm{d}\mu(y) q_y \eta\left(\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle\right), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

*where $q^{\phi}$ denotes the probability density $y\mapsto dq_y\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle$ and $\eta(x) := -x\ln x$. The inequality is tight if $\mathbb{1}/d\in\mathrm{conv}(\{\hat{\phi}_x\})$ where $\{\hat{\phi}_x\}$ consists of the states that optimize Eq.* (6) *and* conv *denotes the convex hull.*

*Proof.* For any pure ensemble $x\mapsto\phi_x := p_x\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}_x|$, let $\sigma := \int \mathrm{d}\mu(x) p_x\hat{\phi}_x$ be the average state. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\phi_x,\pi_y)\\ =&\mathrm{D}\left(dp_xq_y\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\,\middle\|\,dp_xq_y\,\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\hat{\pi}_y]\right)\\ =&d\iint \mathrm{d}\mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y) p_xq_y\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\ln\frac{\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle}{\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\hat{\pi}_y]}. \end{aligned}$$

Since one has

$$\ln\frac{\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle}{\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\hat{\pi}_y]} = \ln\left(d\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\right) - \ln\frac{dq_y\,\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\hat{\pi}_y]}{q_y},$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\phi_x,\pi_y)\\ =&\mathrm{D}\left(dp_xq_y\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\,\middle\|\,p_xq_y\right) - \mathrm{D}\left(dq_y\,\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\hat{\pi}_y]\middle\|q_y\right). \end{aligned}$$

From the non-negativity of the relative entropy one has

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\phi_x,\pi_y)\\ \leq&\mathrm{D}\left(dp_xq_y\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\,\middle\|\,p_xq_y\right)\\ =&d\iint \mathrm{d}\mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y) p_xq_y\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\ln\left(d\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\right)\\ \leq&\max_x\mathrm{D}\left(dq_y\,\langle\hat{\phi}_x|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\hat{\phi}_x\rangle\,\middle\|\,q_y\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from upper bounding the average with the largest element. Notice that both inequalities are saturated iff $\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\hat{\pi}_y] = 1/d$ which is fulfilled whenever there exists a probability density $x\mapsto p_x$ such that $\sigma = \mathbb{1}/d$ and all the states $\hat{\phi}_x$ optimize Eq. (6). □

Notice that, as a trivial consequence of Holevo's theorem [44], the quantity $\ln d - C(\pi)$, for which Lemma 1 provides a lower bound, can be interpreted as a measure of how suboptimal measurement $\pi$ is for communication tasks.

The maximization of the communication capacity can now be significantly simplified in some cases. Indeed, let us set $a := \min_{y,\psi}\langle\psi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\psi\rangle$, $b := \max_{y,\psi}\langle\psi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\psi\rangle$, and let $r:[a,b]\to\mathbb{R}$ be the Hermite interpolating polynomial of $\eta$ such that the assumptions of Lemma 3 in the Appendix are fulfilled (and so $r$ interpolates $\eta$ from below). Then

$$\int \mathrm{d}\mu(y) p_y\eta(\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle) \geq \int \mathrm{d}\mu(y) p_y r(\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle) =: Q(\phi), \tag{7}$$

with equality if and only if $\phi$ is such that all the points of interpolation $x_i$ are of the form $\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle$ (then necessarily the set of all overlaps $\{\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle\}_{y\in A}$ has to be finite). In consequence, we get

$$C(\pi) \leq \ln d - \min_{\phi} Q(\phi). \tag{8}$$

Let us now assume that we have some predictions about the state that minimizes the lhs of the inequality in Eq. (7) and let $\phi_0$ be the supposed minimizer. Then, if the points of interpolation are chosen to be $\{\langle\phi_0|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi_0\rangle\}_{y\in A}$, in order to show that $\phi_0$ is indeed a minimizer, it is enough to show that $\phi_0$ minimizes $Q$. In particular, this becomes trivial whenever $Q(\phi)$ is constant. In consequence, we get the equality in Eq. (8) exactly as in Lemma 1. The remainder of this work is devoted to the quantification of $C(\pi)$ through the optimization of $Q(\phi)$, for the specific case of $t$ designs.

### C. Main results

Our first main result is an upper bound on the capacity $C(\pi)$ of any $t$ design POVM $\pi$, as a function of the dimension and of the indices of coincidence $\gamma_k(\chi)$ (or, equivalently, of the moments $\mu_k(\pi)$), for $t \in [1,5]$.

**Theorem 1.** *The classical capacity $C(\pi)$ of any $t$ design POVM $\pi$ is upper bounded by $C(\pi) \leq C_t$, where*

$$\begin{cases} C_1 = & \ln d \\ C_2 = & \ln d + \ln \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}, \\ C_3 = & \ln d + \frac{d(\gamma_1-\gamma_2)^2}{\gamma_1-2\gamma_2+\gamma_3} \ln \frac{\gamma_2-\gamma_3}{\gamma_1-\gamma_2}, \\ C_4 = & \ln d + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\gamma_3^2-\gamma_2\gamma_4}{\gamma_2^2-\gamma_1\gamma_3} \\ & + \frac{d(\gamma_1^2\gamma_4-3\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3+2\gamma_2^3)}{2\sqrt{\Delta_4}} \ln \frac{\gamma_2\gamma_3-\gamma_1\gamma_4+\sqrt{\Delta_4}}{\gamma_2\gamma_3-\gamma_1\gamma_4-\sqrt{\Delta_4}}, \end{cases}$$

*with* $\Delta_4 = -3\gamma_2^2\gamma_3^2 + 4\gamma_1\gamma_3^3 + 4\gamma_2^3\gamma_4 - 6\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_5 + \gamma_1^2\gamma_4^2$.

*Proof.* Let $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil} \leq 1$ and let $x_{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil} = 1$ iff $t$ is odd. According to Lemma 3, the polynomial $r(x) := \sum_i a_i x^i$ of degree at most $t$ such that $r(x_k) = \eta(x_k)$ for any $k \in [0, \lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil]$ and $r'(x_k) = \eta'(x_k)$ for any $k \in [1, \lceil \frac{t-1}{2} \rceil]$ is such that $r(x) \leq \eta(x)$ for any $x \in [0,1]$. Therefore Eq. (6) becomes

$$C(\pi) \leq C_t := \ln d - d \sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i \gamma_i,$$

where we used the fact that the index of coincidence $\gamma_i$ is independent of the choice of $\phi$ for $i \leq t$.

In order to upper bound $C(\pi)$, we express $\{a_i\}$ as a function of $\{x_k\}$ and minimize $C_t$ over $\{x_k\}$. $C_1$ is an immediate result as it does not involve any optimization. Upon denoting with $\{x_k^*\}$ the optimal solution one has

$$\begin{cases} x_1^* = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}, & \text{for } t = 2, \\ x_1^* = \frac{\gamma_2-\gamma_3}{\gamma_1-\gamma_2}, & \text{for } t = 3, \\ x_{1,2}^* = \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_4-\gamma_2\gamma_3 \pm \sqrt{\Delta_4}}{2(\gamma_1\gamma_3-\gamma_2^2)}, & \text{for } t = 4. \end{cases}$$

□

The expression for $C_5$ is too lengthy to be reproduced here, but the derivation goes along the same lines as that of $C_4$ with

$$x_{1,2}^* = \frac{\gamma_2\gamma_3 - \gamma_3^2 - \gamma_1\gamma_4 + \gamma_3\gamma_4 + \gamma_1\gamma_5 - \gamma_2\gamma_5 \pm \sqrt{\Delta_5}}{2(\gamma_2^2 + \gamma_3^2 + \gamma_1(\gamma_4-\gamma_3) - \gamma_2(\gamma_3+\gamma_4))},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_5 = & \big(\gamma_3(\gamma_3-\gamma_2-\gamma_4) + \gamma_1(\gamma_4-\gamma_5) + \gamma_2\gamma_5\big)^2 \\ & + 4\left(\gamma_2^2 + \gamma_3^2 + \gamma_1(\gamma_4-\gamma_3) - \gamma_2(\gamma_3+\gamma_4)\right) \\ & \times \left(\gamma_4(\gamma_2-\gamma_4) - \gamma_3^2 - \gamma_2\gamma_5 + \gamma_3(\gamma_4+\gamma_5)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the optimization over $\{x_k\}$ in the proof of Theorem 1 is over $\lceil \frac{t-1}{2} \rceil$ real parameters, and becomes cumbersome for $t$ larger than 5, namely for 3 parameters or more.

Notice also that, as expected, the bounds in Theorem 1 reduce to those given in Ref. [31] for projective $t$ designs, i.e. when $\mu_k(\chi) = 1$ for all $k \in [1,t]$.

Our second main result is the derivation of the capacity $C(\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\pi))$ for the depolarized version of several $t$-design POVMs: 2-dimensional SIC [23, 24, 27–31, 55] (tetrahedron), complete MUB [27, 31] (octahedron), or icosahedron [27, 31]; 3-dimensional SIC [28, 29] or complete MUB [30, 31]; 8-dimensional Hoggar SIC [32]; $d$-dimensional anti-SIC or uniform rank-one [45] POVM.

**Theorem 2.** *The classical capacity $C(\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\pi))$ of the depolarized POVM $\pi$, where $\pi$ is a 2-dimensional SIC (tetrahedron), complete MUB (octahedron), or icosahedron, or 3-dimensional SIC or complete MUB, or 8-dimensional Hoggar SIC, or $d$-dimensional anti-SIC, or the uniform rank-one POVM is given by*

$$\begin{cases} C_{tetra} = & \ln 2 - \frac{\eta\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{2}\right) + 3\eta\left(\frac{3+\lambda}{6}\right)}{2}, \\ C_{octa} = & \ln 2 - \frac{\eta\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{2}\right) + 4\eta\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \eta\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{2}\right)}{3}, \\ C_{icosa} = & \ln 2 - \frac{\eta\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{2}\right) + 5\eta\left(\frac{5-\sqrt{5}\lambda}{10}\right) + 5\eta\left(\frac{5+\sqrt{5}\lambda}{10}\right) + \eta\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{2}\right)}{6}, \\ C_{3SIC} = & C_{3MUB} = \ln 3 - \eta\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{3}\right) - 2\eta\left(\frac{2+\lambda}{6}\right), \\ C_{Hoggar} = & \ln 8 - \frac{7\eta\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{8}\right) + 9\eta\left(\frac{9+7\lambda}{72}\right)}{2}, \\ C_{anti\text{-}SIC} = & \ln d - \frac{1}{d}\eta\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{d}\right) - \frac{d^2-1}{d}\eta\left(\frac{d^2-1+\lambda}{d(d^2-1)}\right), \\ C_{uniform} = & \ln(1-\lambda) + \lambda + \frac{d\lambda^2\,{}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(1,1;d+2;-\frac{d\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)}{(d+1)(1-\lambda)}, \end{cases}$$

*where ${}_2\mathrm{F}_1$ denotes the hypergeometric function [46]. Moreover, the optimal ensembles for the depolarized versions of $\pi$ are exactly the same as for $\pi$ and they all average to the maximally mixed state.*

*Proof.* It is well known that all the rank-one POVMs $\pi$ included in the theorem are projective $t$ designs, with $t = 3$ if $\pi$ is a 2-dimensional complete MUB, $t = 5$ if $\pi$ is an icosahedron, $t = \infty$ if $\pi$ is the uniform distribution, and $t = 2$ otherwise. It is easy to observe that the $d$-dimensional anti-SIC is a mixed 2-design. Thus, due to Eq. (4), $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\pi)$ is also a $t$ design.

Let us first discuss the case where $t$ is finite. Let us recall what the optimal ensembles are for POVMs $\pi$, as

given in Refs. [27–32]. We get the dual tetrahedron for tetrahedral SIC and 'dual' Hoggar lines for the Hoggar SIC, (the same) octahedron and icosahedron for octahedral and icosahedral POVMs, respectively, the Hesse SIC for 3-dimensional complete MUB and finally an orthonormal basis consisting of states orthogonal to exactly 3 different $\pi_y$ for generic 3-dimensional SIC or the complete MUB for the Hesse SIC (note that the existence of such a basis was proved in Ref. [47] for the group-covariant (Weyl-Heisenberg) case while just recently Ref. [48] gave the proof that there are no other qutrit SICs). We shall also show that for the anti-SIC, the optimal ensemble is given by the SIC itself. Notice that all these ensembles average to the maximally mixed state.

For any state $\phi$ of such an ensemble one has

$$\langle\phi|\,\hat{\pi}_y\,|\phi\rangle = \begin{cases} x_0 \times m_0, \\ \dots \\ x_l \times m_l \end{cases},$$

where $x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_l$, $x_1 = 0$ and $x_l = 1$ whenever $t$ is odd. Here the notation $x_k \times m_k$ denotes the value $x_k$ with multiplicity $m_k$. Moreover, in all these cases there are exactly $\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil + 1$ different values of $x_k$, thus $l := \lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil$. Therefore one has

$$\langle\phi|\,\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\hat{\pi})\,|\phi\rangle = \begin{cases} \lambda x_0 + (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{d} \times m_0, \\ \dots \\ \lambda x_{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil} + (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{d} \times m_{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{cases} \lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{d} := \min_{\phi,y} \mathrm{Tr}[\phi \mathcal{D}_\lambda(\hat{\pi}_y)], \\ \lambda x_{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil + 1} + (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{d} := \max_{\phi,y} \mathrm{Tr}[\phi \mathcal{D}_\lambda(\hat{\pi}_y)] \quad \text{if } t \text{ is odd}, \end{cases}$$

Therefore, according to Lemma 3, the Hermite interpolating polynomial $r$ such that $r(x_k) = \eta(x_k)$ for any $k \in [0, \lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil]$ and $r'(x_k) = \eta'(x_k)$ for any $k \in [1, \lceil \frac{t-1}{2} \rceil]$ is such that $\deg r \leq t$ and $r(x) \leq \eta(x)$ for any $x \in [\frac{1-\lambda}{d}, \lambda + (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{d}]$. Therefore, the average of this polynomial has to be constant and according to our remarks at the end of Sec. II B, the maximum in Eq. (6) is attained by $\phi$.

Let us now discuss the case $t = \infty$. The statement follows by expanding $\eta(x) = -x \ln x$ in Lemma 1 in a Taylor series around $\lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{d}$, applying the binomial theorem, replacing $x = \lambda |\langle\phi|\,U_g\,|\phi\rangle|^2 + \frac{1-\lambda}{d}$, and using the identity $\int \mathrm{d}g |\langle\phi|\,U_g\,|\phi\rangle|^{2k} = \binom{d+k-1}{k}^{-1}$. Notice that the series for $\eta(x)$ has radius of convergence $\lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{d}$, which is also equal to $b := \max_\psi \langle\psi|\,\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\hat{\pi}_y)\,|\psi\rangle$, therefore $\eta(x)$ is equivalent to its series in $[a, b]$. □

Notice that, as expected, the capacities in Theorem 2 reduce to those given in Refs. [23, 27–32, 45] for projective $t$ designs when one takes the limit $\lambda \to 1$.

The results of Theorems 1 and 2 are represented in Figs. 1, 2, and 3, in the 2-, 3-, and 8-dimensional cases, respectively.




Figure 1. (Color online) Classical capacities of qubit mixed $t$-design POVMs as a function of the depolarizing parameter $\lambda$. Dashed lines, from top to bottom, represent the upper bounds on the capacity of the depolarized version of any projective 2 design (blue) and 3 design (red), as given by Theorem 1. Solid lines, from top to bottom, represent the capacities of the depolarized version of any SIC (blue), complete MUB (red), icosahedron (purple), and uniform distribution (green), as given by Theorem 2.




Figure 2. (Color online) Classical capacities of qutrit mixed $t$-design POVMs as a function of the depolarizing parameter $\lambda$. Dashed lines, from top to bottom, represent the upper bounds on the capacity of the depolarized version of any projective 2 design (blue) and any anti projective 2 design (red), as given by Theorem 1. Solid lines, from top to bottom, represent the capacities of the depolarized version of any SIC and MUB (blue), uniform distribution (green), and anti-SIC (red), as given by Theorem 2.

Finally, let us notice that the capacity $C(\pi)$ of any measurement $\pi$ can be expressed in terms of the well-known accessible information [44, 45, 49–56] $A(\rho) := \max_\pi I(\rho, \pi)$ of ensemble $\rho$, where the maximum is over any POVM $\pi$. The relation is given by $C(\pi) = \max_\sigma A(\sigma^{1/2}\pi\sigma^{1/2})$, where by $\sigma^{1/2}\pi\sigma^{1/2}$ we mean the ensemble $y \mapsto \frac{1}{d}\sigma^{1/2}\pi_y\sigma^{1/2}$ and the maximum is taken over all states $\sigma$. Therefore, in general one has $W(\pi) \geq A(\frac{1}{d}\pi)$, and thus the upper bound on $C(\pi)$ provided




Figure 3. (Color online) Classical capacities of 8-dimensional mixed $t$-design POVMs as a function of the depolarizing parameter $\lambda$. Dashed lines, from top to bottom, represent the upper bounds on the capacity of the depolarized version of any projective 2 design (blue) and any anti projective 2 design (red), as given by Theorem 1. Solid lines, from top to bottom, represent the capacities of the depolarized version of any Hoggar SIC (blue), uniform distribution (green), and anti-SIC (red), as given by Theorem 2.

in Thm. 1 also upper bounds the accessible information $A(\frac{1}{d}\pi)$. Moreover, whenever the ensemble attaining the capacity for POVM $\pi$ averages to the maximally mixed state, one has that [23] the informational power $W(\pi) = A(\frac{1}{d}\pi)$. Therefore, the expressions for the capacities in Thm. 2 also represent the accessible information $A(\frac{1}{d}\pi)$ of the corresponding ensembles.

## III. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

In this work we introduced mixed quantum $t$ designs as the most general arbitrary-rank extension of projective $t$ designs that preserves indistinguishability from the uniform distribution given $t$ copies. We addressed the problem of quantifying the communication capacity of mixed $t$ design measurements by deriving upper bounds on such a quantity for any $t \in [1, 5]$. We refined our results by providing a closed-form solution for the communication capacity of several mixed $t$ designs measurements, including the depolarized version of: any qubit and qutrit SIC and MUBs, any qubit icosahedral measurement, any Hoggar SIC, any anti-SIC, and the uniform distribution.

One might conjecture that the quantification of the communication capacity of mixed $(t = \infty)$-design measurements would shine new light on the problem of lower bounding the communication capacity of mixed quantum POVMs, in the same way as the quantification [45] of the accessible information of projective $(t = \infty)$-designs allowed for the computation of a lower bound on the accessible information of ensembles of pure states.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Jung Jun Park for pointing out the relation between the index of coincidence of mixed $t$ designs and Bell polynomials, as expressed in Eq. (3). M.D. is grateful to Francesco Buscemi, Massimiliano F. Sacchi, and Vlatko Vedral for valuable discussions. This work is supported by Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 3 (Grant No. MOE2012-T3-1-009).

### Appendix A: Hermite interpolation

For the completeness of our reasoning we add a brief description of the optimization method based on Hermite interpolation, first introduced in this context and discussed in detail in Ref. [27]. Let us first recall the well known formula for the Hermite interpolation error.

**Lemma 2.** *Let $a \leq x_0 < \cdots < x_{m-1} \leq b$ be reals and let $\{j_i\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ be positive integers. Let $\eta(x)$ be a real function with at least $t+1$ continuous derivatives on $[a, b]$ and let $r(x)$ be its Hermite interpolating polynomial, namely the polynomial of degree at most $t := \sum_i j_i - 1$ that agrees with $\eta(x)$ at $x_i$ up to derivative of order $j_i - 1$ for all $i$, i.e.*

$$r^{(k)}(x_i) = \eta^{(k)}(x_i), \qquad \forall 0 \leq k \leq j_i - 1, \quad 0 \leq i \leq m-1.$$

*Then for any $x \in [a, b]$ there exists $x'$ such that $\min(x, x_0) < x' < \max(x, x_{m-1})$ and*

$$\eta(x) - r(x) = \frac{\eta^{(t+1)}(x')}{(t+1)!} \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} (x - x_i)^{j_i}.$$

*Proof.* See, e.g. Ref. [57]. □

In this work we set $\eta(x) := -x \ln(x)$. Next lemma provides sufficient conditions for the polynomial $r$ to interpolate $\eta$ from below.

**Lemma 3.** *Let $m \geq 2$, $x_0 = a$ and $j_0 = 1$. Then whenever*

*a. $x_{m-1} = b$, $j_{m-1} = 1$ and $j_i = 2$ for $0 < i < m-1$, or*

*b. $x_{m-1} < b$, and $j_i = 2$ for $0 < i$,*

*one has $\eta(x) - r(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in [a, b]$.*

*Proof.* The proof was first derived in Ref. [27]. We report it here for clarity.

a. In this case one has

$$\prod_{i=0}^{m-1} (x - x_i)^{j_i} = (x - a)(x - b) \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} (x - x_i)^2 \leq 0.$$

Likewise, $t$ is odd and so $\frac{\eta^{(t+1)}(x')}{(t+1)!} \leq 0$, since all even derivatives of $\eta(x)$ are negative.

b. In this case one has

$$\prod_{i=0}^{m-1}(x-x_i)^{j_i} = (x-a)\prod_{i=0}^{m-1}(x-x_i)^2 \geq 0.$$

Likewise, $t$ is even and $\frac{\eta^{(t+1)}(x')}{(t+1)!} \geq 0$, since all odd (greater than 1) derivatives of $\eta(x)$ are positive. □


[1] A.J. Scott, *Tight informationally complete quantum measurements*, J. Phys. A **39** 13507-13530 (2006).

[2] A. Ambainis and J. Emerson, *"Quantum t-designs: t-wise independence in the quantum world*, in Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity, 129 (2007).

[3] G. Zauner, *Quantendesigns – Grundzuge einer nichtkommutativen Designtheorie*. Dissertation, Universitat Wien, 1999.

[4] A. Koldobsky and H. König, Aspects of the Isometric Theory of Banach Spaces, in Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces, Vol. 1, edited by W. B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss, (North Holland, Dordrecht, 2001), pp. 899–939.

[5] J.M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, J. Math. Phys. *Informationally Complete Quantum Measurements* **45**, 2171 (2004).

[6] D. M. Appleby, *Symmetric informationally completepositive operator valued measures and the extended Clifford group*, J. Math. Phys. **46**, 052107 (2005).

[7] A. J. Scott and M. Grassl, *Symmetric informationally complete positive-operator-valued measures: A new computer study* J. Math. Phys. **51**, 042203 (2010).

[8] T. Y. Chien, *Equiangular lines, projective symmetries and nice error frames*, https://www.math.auckland.ac.nz/ waldron/Tuan/Thesis.pdf.

[9] A. Klappenecker and M. Roetteler, *Mutually unbiased bases are complex projective 2-designs* Proceedings 2005 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2005), 1740 (2005).

[10] I. Bengtsson, *Three Ways to Look at Mutually Unbiased Bases*, AIP Conf. Proc. *889*, 40 (2007).

[11] P. Butterley and W. Hall, *Numerical evidence for the maximum number of mutually unbiased bases in dimension six*, Phys. Lett. A **369**, 5 (2007).

[12] S. Brierley and S. Weigert, *Maximal sets of mutually unbiased quantum states in dimension six*, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 042312 (2008).

[13] S. Brierley, S. Weigert, and I. Bengtsson, *All mutually unbiased bases in dimensions two to five* Quantum Info. & Comp. **10**, 0803 (2010).

[14] D. M. Appleby, Optics and Spectroscopy, *Symmetric informationally complete measurements of arbitrary rank* **103**, 416 (2007).

[15] A. Kalev and G. Gour, *Construction of all general symmetric informationally complete measurements* J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 335302 (2014).

[16] A. Kalev and G. Gour, *Mutually unbiased measurements in finite dimensions* New Journal of Physics **16**, 053038 (2014).

[17] A. E. Rastegin, *Notes on general SIC-POVMs* Physica Scripta **89**, 085101 (2014).

[18] B. Chen, and S.-H. Fei, *Uncertainty relations based on mutually unbiased measurements* Quant. Inf. Proc. **14**, 2227 (2015).

[19] M. A. Graydon, D. M. Appleby, *Quantum conical designs*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **49**, 085301 (2016).

[20] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, *Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing*, in Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing 175, 8 (1984).

[21] D. P. DiVincenzo, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, *Locking Classical Correlations in Quantum States*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 067902 (2004).

[22] C. E. Shannon, *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*, Bell System Technical Journal **27**, 379 (1948).

[23] M. Dall'Arno, G. M. D'Ariano, and M. F. Sacchi, *Informational power of quantum measurements*, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062304 (2011).

[24] O. Oreshkov, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, and E. Bagan, *Optimal signal states for quantum detectors*, New J. Phys. **13**, 073032 (2011).

[25] A. S. Holevo, *Information capacity of a quantum observable*, Problems of Information Transmission **48**, 1 (2012).

[26] A. S. Holevo, *Information capacities of quantum measurement channels*, Phys. Scr. **2013**, 014034 (2013).

[27] W. Słomczyński and A. Szymusiak, *Highly symmetric POVMs and their informational power*, Quant. Inf. Proc. **15**, 565 (2016).

[28] M. Dall'Arno, F. Buscemi, and M. Ozawa, *Tight bounds on accessible information and informational power*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 235302 (2014).

[29] A. Szymusiak, *Maximally informative ensembles for SIC-POVMs in dimension 3*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 445301 (2014).

[30] M. Dall'Arno, *Accessible information and informational power of quantum 2-designs* , Phys. Rev. A **90**, 052311 (2014).

[31] M. Dall'Arno, *Hierarchy of bounds on accessible information and informational power*, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012328 (2015).

[32] A. Szymusiak and W. Słomczyński, *Informational power of the Hoggar symmetric informationally complete positive operator-valued measure*, Phys. Rev. A 94, 012122 (2016).

[33] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, *Quantum Information and Computation* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[34] E.T. Bell, *Partition Polynomials*, Annals of Mathematics **29**, 38 (1927).

[35] S. Bandyopadhyay, P.O. Boykin, V. Roychowdhury, F. Vatan, *A new proof for the existence of mutually unbiased bases*, Algorithmica **34**, 512 (2002).

[36] G. Mauro D'Ariano, M. G. A. Paris, M. De Laurentis, A. Porzio, S. Solimeno, *Quantum tomography as a tool for the characterization of optical devices* J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **4**, 127 (2002).

[37] F. Buscemi, M. J. W. Hall, M. Ozawa, and M. M. Wilde, *Noise and Disturbance in Quantum Measurements: An Information-Theoretic Approach*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**,

050401 (2014).

[38] C. A. Fuchs and M. Sasaki, *Squeezing Quantum Information through a Classical Channel: Measuring the Quantumness of a Set of Quantum States*, Quant. Inf. Comp. **3**, 377 (2003).

[39] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, *Quantum-Bayesian coherence* Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 1693 (2013).

[40] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, *A quantum-Bayesian route to quantum state space* Foundations of Physics **41**, 345 (2011).

[41] D. M. Appleby, Å. Ericsson, and C. A. Fuchs, *Properties of QBist state spaces* Foundations of Physics **41**, 564 (2011).

[42] C. Fuchs, *Interview with a Quantum Bayesian* arXiv:1207.2141

[43] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Hoboken, Wiley-Interscience, 2006).

[44] A. S. Holevo, *Statistical decision theory for quantum systems* J. Multivariate Anal. **3**, 337 (1973).

[45] R. Jozsa, D. Robb, and W. K Wootters, *A Lower Bound for Accessible Information in Quantum Mechanics* Phys. Rev. A **49**, 668 (1994).

[46] F.W.J. Olver, D.W. Lozier, R.F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[47] H.B. Dang, K. Blanchfield, I. Bengtsson, D.M. Appleby, *Linear dependencies in Weyl- Heisenberg orbits*, Quantum Inf. Process. **12**, 3449-3475 (2013)

[48] L.P. Hughston, S.M. Salamon, *Surveying points in the complex projective plane*, Adv. Math. **286**, 1017-1052 (2016)

[49] D. S. Lebedev, L. B. Levitin, *Information transmission by electromagnetic field*, Information and Control **9**, 1 (1966).

[50] L. B. Levitin, *Information in direct and indirect quantum measurements*, in "Physics and Computation," IEEE Computer Society Press, 220 (1992).

[51] L. B. Levitin, *Optimal quantum measurements for two pure and mixed states*, in "Quantum Communication and Measurements," V.P. Belavkin, O. Hirota, and R.L. Hudson, 1995, 439.

[52] L. B. Levitin, *On the quantum measure of information*, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie **21**, 345 (1996).

[53] V. P. Belavkin, *Optimal quantum multiple hypothesis testing* Stochastics **1**, 315 (1975).

[54] V. P. Belavkin, *Optimum distinction of non-orthogonal quantum signals* Radio Engineering and Electronic Physics **20**, 39 (1975).

[55] E. B. Davies, *Information and quantum measurement* IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **24**, 596 (1978).

[56] I. Devetak and A. Winter, *Distilling common randomness from bipartite quantum states* IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **50**, 3183 (2004).

[57] J. Stoer, R. Bulirsch, *Introduction to numerical analysis* (Springer, New York, 2012).